

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 6-10 have been canceled in favor of new claims 11-15. Support for the subject matter of the new claims is provided at least in the original claims. The amendments were not presented earlier due to the unforeseeability of the remarks presented in the Final Rejection.

Claims 6-10 were rejected, under 35 USC § 102(e), as being anticipated by Stewart et al. (US 7,260,770). To the extent these rejections may be deemed applicable to new claims 11-15, the Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 11 recites features of cancelled claim 6 and defines an input control apparatus that receives and performs dematching processing on a turbo encoded signal having systematic part bits and parity parts bits. The input control apparatus discards systematic and parity bits of the received and dematched signal, prior to performing turbo decoding, such that the number of bits in one sequence of the parity parts is less than the number of bits in the systematic part. The claimed subject matter provides an advantage of reducing the number of bits required for performing a decoding calculation in a turbo decoder, so that the memory capacity required in this calculation is reduced and the circuit scale of the apparatus is reduced (see specification page 6, line 22, through page 7, line 10). (It should be noted that references herein to the specification and drawings are for illustrative purposes only and are not intended to limit the scope of the invention to the referenced embodiments.)

Stewart discloses, in Fig. 6, a redundancy scheme in which coded bits are read equally from systematic and parity interleavers starting at their respective starting rows and all bits prior

to the starting rows are discarded (see Stewart col. 7, lines 10-14). The Applicants' claimed subject matter and Stewart's disclosure share in common the feature of discarding information and parity bits.

However, Stewart's disclosure relates to puncturing that is carried out immediately after turbo coding and, therefore, is directed to a rate matching device for a transmission apparatus (see Stewart, abstract). More specifically, Stewart's rate matching device corresponds to that identified by reference numeral 12 in the transmission apparatus 10 of Applicant's Fig. 1.

By contrast to Stewart's disclosure, the Applicants' claimed subject matter receives a turbo encoded and punctured signal and discards bits of the received signal after performing rate dematching processing and before performing turbo decoding. Thus, the Applicants' claimed subject matter reduces the number of bits within a received signal before turbo decoding and, therefore, is directed to subject matter of a receiving apparatus, rather than a transmitting apparatus as is Stewart's rate matching device.

Stewart does not disclose a specific receiving apparatus configuration, but only discloses a transmitting apparatus configuration. As a result, Stewart cannot be considered to disclose the Applicants' claimed subject matter of an apparatus that discards bits of a received signal after performing rate dematching processing and before performing turbo decoding processing. Further, Stewart does not achieve the above-noted advantage of the instant claimed invention of enabling decoding calculation in a turbo decoder with a small number of bits, so that the memory capacity required in this calculation is reduced and the circuit scale is reduced.

Thus, the instant claimed invention differs from Stewart in both circuit configuration and results.

Accordingly, the Applicant submits that Stewart does not anticipate the subject matter defined by new claim 11. Independent claim 15 similarly recites the above-mentioned subject matter distinguishing apparatus claim 11 from the applied references, but with respect to a method. Therefore, allowance of claims 11 and 15 and all claims dependent therefrom is warranted.

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

If any issues remain which may best be resolved through a telephone communication, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at the local Washington, D.C. telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/James Edward Ledbetter/

Date: July 1, 2009
JEL/DWW/att

James E. Ledbetter
Registration No. 28,732

Attorney Docket No. 009289-06128
Dickinson Wright PLLC
1875 Eye Street, NW, Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 659-6966
Facsimile: (202) 659-1559